

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1–30, and 37-39 are pending in this application.

Claims 4-7 and 19-21 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 2, 14, 16, 17, 18, 28, 30, 37 and 38 have been amended.

Regarding the § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 8, 13-17, 22, 27-30 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fjelstad (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,699).

Fjelstad teaches metallic contact tabs that wrap around the sides of a bump lead from a electronic device, thereby creating a socket for engaging the bump leads. Contrary to the Examiner's statements that all elements are disclosed in the Fjelstad reference, Applicant respectfully submits that Fjelstad does not teach or anticipate a structure that is adapted to be extended out of the plane by a distance greater than a maximum lateral dimension of the structure. In particular, the structures of Fjelstad extend less than half of the maximum lateral dimension of the structure. See Fjelstad Figs. 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15. None of the Fjelstad structures extend a distance greater than the lateral dimension of the structure. As such, the § 102 rejection of independent claims 1 and 17 are unsupported, taught or anticipated by the cited art and should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 17 are ready for allowance.

Claim 2, as amended, is not anticipated by Fjelstad for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, claim 2 has been amended to recite "an insulated pathway formed on said structure." Applicant submits that Fjelstad does not teach an insulated pathway, but

instead, teaches an uninsulated connector. Applicant respectfully requests that this § 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that claim 2 is ready for allowance.

Claims 8 and 13 are dependent upon independent claim 1 and are therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is dependent upon claim 1 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, claim 14 has been amended to clarify that the perforations are "dashed perforations." Applicant submits that "dashed perforations" are not taught, alluded to or supported by Fjelstad and therefore requests that a § 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that claim 14 is ready for allowance.

Claim 15 is dependent upon independent claim 1 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 16 is dependent upon claim 1 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, claim 16 has been amended to clarify that the first pathway and the second pathway are each insulated pathways. Fjelstad does not teach or anticipate a first and second insulated pathway. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that claim 16 is ready for allowance.

Independent claim 17, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, recites "said flexible and extensible structure is adapted to be extended out of said plane by a distance greater than a maximum lateral dimension of said structure." Fjelstad does not teach or anticipate this element, therefore the rejection to claim 17 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, claim 17 has been amended to recite "an insulated pathway on said structure." The cited art does not teach, anticipate, or support insulated pathways on an extensible structure. As

such, Applicant further believes that claim 17 is not anticipated by Fjelstad and respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 22, 27 and 29 are each dependent upon claim 17 and are therefore not anticipated for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 28 is dependent upon claim 17 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 17. Furthermore, claim 28 has been amended to clarify that the perforations are "dashed perforations" which are not taught, anticipated, or supported by the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 30 is dependent upon claim 17 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 17. Furthermore, claim 30 recites, "a second insulated pathway on said structure." Applicant respectfully points out that Fjelstad does not teach a first, let alone a second, insulated pathway. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 30 is not taught, alluded to or anticipated by Fjelstad and respectfully requests that this § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 37 has been amended to recite, "a capillary for transferring fluid on said structure." Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that such a capillary would be allowable over the cited art. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 is ready for allowance.

Claim 38 is dependent upon claim 37 and is therefore not anticipated for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 37. Furthermore, claim 38 has been amended to recite, "an insulated pathway formed on said structure." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not teach, allude to or support such an insulated pathway and submits that claim 38 is ready for allowance.

Claim 39 is dependent upon claim 37 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 39.

Regarding the § 103 Rejection

Claim 9-12 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being rendered obvious by Fjelstad.

Claims 9-12 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claim 1, which recites among other things that "said structure is adapted to be extended out of said plane by a distance greater than a maximum lateral dimension of said structure." As discussed above, Fjelstad does not teach, allude to, anticipate or render obvious such a structure. In fact, there is no cited art to date that teaches the claimed an element. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn with respect to claims 9, 10, 11 and 12.

With respect to claims 23-26, these claims are each either directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 17, which recites, among other things that "said flexible and extensible structure is adapted to be extended out of said plane by a distance greater than a maximum lateral dimension of said structure." Fjelstad does not teach, allude to, render obvious or anticipate such a structure. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn for claims 23-26.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: FEB 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Greenfield

Registration No.: 38,166

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant